

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

LAMONT WIGFALL,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 2:08-cv-15  
HON. R. ALLAN EDGAR

LINDA M. METRISH,

Respondent.

/

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Michigan state prisoner Lamont Wigfall filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The habeas petition was referred to Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley for a report and recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.1(d).

On June 15, 2010, Magistrate Judge Greeley submitted his report and recommendation. [Doc. No. 21]. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the habeas petition be denied and that any application for a certificate of appealability be denied pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

Petitioner Wigfall has not timely filed an objection to the report and recommendation. After reviewing the record, the Court **ACCEPTS and ADOPTS** the report and recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). The Court concludes that the 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for writ of habeas corpus shall be **DENIED and DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

If petitioner Wigfall files a notice of appeal, it will be treated as an application for a

certificate of appealability which shall be **DENIED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) and Fed. R. App. P. 22(b)(1). For the reasons expressed in the report and recommendation, petitioner Wigfall has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. Reasonable jurists could not find that this decision to dismiss with prejudice each and every claim for relief presented in the habeas petition is debatable or erroneous. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 338 (2009); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Webb v. Mitchell*, 586 F.3d 383, 401 (6th Cir. 2009).

A separate judgment will be entered.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 13, 2010.

---

*/s/ R. Allan Edgar*  
R. ALLAN EDGAR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE